



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,453	12/05/2003	Yulun Wang	157438-0016	9328
1622	7590	04/20/2007		
IRELL & MANELLA LLP 840 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE SUITE 400 NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660			EXAMINER MARC, MCDIEUNEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/728,453		WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	McDieunel Marc		3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-17, 20-27, 30-37, 40-48, 51-59 and 62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,18,19,28,29,38,39,49,50,60 and 61 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-62 are presented for examination.
2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be *a single paragraph* of on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. Correction is required.
See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4. Claims 1-7, 10-17, 20-27, 30-37, 40-48, 51-59 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JHONS HOPKINS MEDICAL INSTITUTIONS (hereinafter Dr. Robot).

As per claim 1, 11, 21, 31, 42 and 53, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system (see fig. on the first page), comprising: a robot that has a camera (see first page, second paragraph line 3), a monitor and a speaker (see first page, second paragraph line 3), said camera captures a video image of a caller recipient (see first page, first and second paragraph); and, a remote station that has a monitor, a microphone to establish a voice communication with said robot (see first page third paragraph), and an alert input (see first page and third paragraph, wherein bedside visits that being done by teleconferencing technology has been taken as alert input) to request the video image during said voice communication (see fig. on the first page), note that the monitor of the robot has shown clear of evidence of a doctor/operator and remote video interactions via the robot; with respect to the broadband network (see pages 1-2 fourth paragraph).

As per claim 2, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said remote station receives the video image from said robot in response to a user input at said robot (see first page and third paragraph, wherein the teleconferencing technology covers that limitation).

As per claim 3, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said robot includes a microphone, said remote station includes a speaker that receives audio from said robot (see first page second and third paragraph, wherein particularly the teleconferencing technology covers that limitation).

As per claims 4-6, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said alert input generates a sound at said robot, and wherein said alert input generates a visual prompt on said robot monitor (see first page second and third paragraph, wherein particularly the teleconferencing technology covers that limitation as described above), note that the robot audio and visual functions; the doctor's picture being taken as a visual prompt which is a graphical icon (see fig. on page one third paragraph).

As per claim 7, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said alert input is generated from a graphical icon of a graphical user interface displayed on said remote station monitor (see fig. on page one third paragraph, wherein the computer terminal being taken as the interface displayed).

As claims 10, 20, 40, 51, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said robot includes a mobile platform (see second paragraph, wherein the robot moves/walks on three balls).

As claims 12, 13, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said remote station means receives the video image from said robot in response to a user input at said robot (see page 1, second paragraph); wherein said robot includes a microphone, said remote station means includes a speaker that receives audio from said robot (see page 1, second and third paragraph as described above).

As claims 14, 24, 34, 45, 56, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said alert input generates a sound at said robot (see page 1, second paragraph as described above).

As claims 16, 26, 36, 47 and 58, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said visual prompt is a graphical icon (see page 1, fourth paragraph, the computer terminal being considered as having graphical icon for manipulating the robot).

As claims 17, 27, 48, 59, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said alert input is generated from a graphical icon of a graphical user interface (see fig. on page one third paragraph, wherein the computer terminal being taken as the interface displayed).

As claims 22 and 23, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system that further comprising inputting a user input before transmitting the video image from the robot to the remote station; and further comprising transmitting audio from the robot to the remote station (see fig. on page one third paragraph, wherein the computer terminal being taken as the interface displayed as described).

As claims 15, 25, 35, 46, 57, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein the alert indicator generates a visual prompt on a robot monitor (see fig. on page one third paragraph, wherein the computer terminal being taken as the interface displayed/monitor).

As claims 30, 62, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system further comprising moving the robot through control commands from the remote station; and further comprising moving the robot through control commands transmitted through the broadband network from the remote station (see pages 1-2 as described).

As per claims 32, 33 and 37, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said remote station receives the video image from said robot through said broadband network in response to a user input at said robot (see pages 1-2 as described); wherein said robot includes a microphone, said remote station includes a speaker that receives audio from said robot through said broadband network wherein said alert input is generated from a graphical icon of a graphical user interface displayed on said remote station monitor (see pages 1-2 as described).

As claims 41, 43, 52, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system further comprising a base station coupled to said broadband network and wirelessly coupled to said robot (see pages 1-2 as described); and wherein said remote station means receives the video image from said robot through said broadband network in response to a user input at said robot (see pages 1-2 as described).

As claims 44, 54, 55, **Dr. Robot** teaches a robot system wherein said robot includes a microphone, said remote station means includes a speaker that receives and transmits audio from said robot through said broadband network (see pages 1-2 as described); and further comprising inputting a user input before transmitting the video image from the robot to the remote station through the broadband network (see pages 1-2 as described).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, 29, 38, 39, 49, 50, 60 and 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fail to teach or fairly suggest with respect to claims 8, 18, 28, 38, 49 and 60 a system wherein said graphical icon has an appearance of a door knocker; with respect to

Application/Control Number:
10/728,453
Art Unit: 3661


Page 5

claims 9, 19 and 50, a system that further comprising a graphical icon that has an appearance of a horn; with respect to claims 29 and 61, a system that further comprising generating a sound at the robot by selecting a graphical icon that has an appearance of a horn in combination with the other features of the claimed invention.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to McDieunel Marc whose telephone number is (571) 272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


McDieunel Marc

Saturday, April 07, 2007

MM/


THOMAS BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER